APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,685	05/17/2006	Carlos Henrique Arglebe Gilek	11371-117	9592

757   7590   05/18/2009
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER
CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory

1. As per claim 9, in view of the remarks, the 112-2nd Paragraph rejection as set forth in the Final office action has been withdrawn.

2. As per claim 1, Applicant asserts "Rosner does not disclose enabling access authorization to the system technician when the first authentication is authenticated at a first data processing unit and the second authentication is authenticated at a second data processing unit." (Remarks, Page 7 Last Para). Examiner respectfully disagrees because the first and the second processing units, as recited in the claim, are not necessarily two different / separate processing units and instead could be merely corresponding to the sequence when reciting the claim limitations. Examiner notes Applicant's argument has no merit since the alleged limitation has not been recited into the claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

3. Furthermore as per claim 1, Applicant asserts "one skilled in the art would not combine Affleck et al. and Rosner (Remarks: Page 8 / 1st Para). Examiner disagrees because both of prior-arts are intended to resolve the same technical problem to provide a highly secured authentication mechanism to authenticate / authorize the access to sensitive information. Besides, According to MPEP § 2145, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, Examiner notes one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

4. As per claim 5, the new limitations were clearly not present in the claims and entry of this language would require reopening of prosecution for additional search or reconsideration.

/Longbit Chai/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431